

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

United States of America,

Criminal No. 09-375(1) (DWF/RLE)

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATION**

Christopher Michael Strong,

Defendant.

Clifford B. Wardlaw, Assistant United States Attorney, United States Attorney's Office,
counsel for Plaintiff.

Caroline Durham, Assistant Federal Defender, Office of the Federal Defender, counsel
for Defendant.

This matter is before the Court upon Defendant Christopher Michael Strong's ("Defendant") objections to Chief Magistrate Judge Raymond L. Erickson's Report and Recommendation dated February 1, 2010, recommending that: (1) the Defendant's Motion to Suppress Evidence Obtained as a Result of Search and Seizure be denied; and (2) the Defendant's Motion to Suppress Statements, Admissions, and Answers be denied, as moot.

The Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the record, including a review of the arguments and submissions of counsel, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 72.2(b). The factual background for the above-entitled matter is clearly and

precisely set forth in the Report and Recommendation and is incorporated by reference for purposes of Defendant's objections.

Based upon the *de novo* review of the record, which included the Court reviewing the Magistrate Judge's finding that the affidavit supporting the search warrant contained probable cause and the Court concluding that the affidavit established probable cause; the Court having reviewed the arguments and submissions of the parties; and the Court being otherwise duly advised in the premises, the Court hereby enters the following:

ORDER

1. Defendant Christopher Michael Strong's objections (Doc. No. [39]) to Chief Magistrate Judge Raymond L. Erickson's Report and Recommendation dated February 1, 2010, are **DENIED**.

2. Chief Magistrate Judge Raymond L. Erickson's Report and Recommendation dated February 1, 2010 (Doc. No. [30]), is **ADOPTED**.

3. The Defendant's Motion to Suppress Evidence Obtained as a Result of Search and Seizure (Doc. No. [22]) is **DENIED**.

4. The Defendant's Motion to Suppress Statements, Admissions, and Answers (Doc. No. [23]) is **DENIED, AS MOOT**.

Dated: March 8, 2010

s/Donovan W. Frank
DONOVAN W. FRANK
United States District Judge